UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,667	12/28/2004	Manfred Wittenstein	04-617	7402
34704 7590 02/24/2009 BACHMAN & LAPOINTE, P.C.				INER
900 CHAPEL STREET			KOEHLER, CHRISTOPHER M	
SUITE 1201 NEW HAVEN, CT 06510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3726	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/24/2009	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Interview Summary	10/519,667	WITTENSTEIN ET AL.				
interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Christopher M. Koehler	3726				
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):						
(1) <u>Christopher M. Koehler</u> .	(3)					
(2) <u>William Slate</u> .	(4)					
Date of Interview: 10 February 2009.						
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)⊡ Video Conference c)⊡ Personal [copy given to: 1)⊡ applicant 2	)∏ applicant's representative	·]				
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.					
Claim(s) discussed: <u>N/A</u> .						
Identification of prior art discussed: <u>N/A</u> .						
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) № N/A.						
Substance of Interview including description of the general reached, or any other comments: <u>Applicant contacted the eaction summary which had incorrectly stated that applicant action. The examiner indicated that this was indeed a typo for reply to the non-final office action and that an interview of the followable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no contact the general reached in the general reached action summary which had incorrectly stated that applicant action. The examiner indicated that this was indeed a typo for reply to the non-final office action and that an interview is a summary to the summary that the summary indicated that the eaction summary which had incorrectly stated that applicant action. The examiner indicated that this was indeed a typo for reply to the non-final office action and that an interview is a summary that the summary </u>	xaminer regarding a typograp had a 1 month period for reply graphical error and that the ag summary would be created ind ments which the examiner ago	hical error on the y to the non-final oplicant has a 3 indicating as such.	e office office month period er the claims			
allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached		odia render the	Ciaiiiis			
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE A INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTIFILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERPREPARTS ON REVERSE SIDE OF ON Attached sheet.	last Office action has already OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY ERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, V	been filed, APP ' DAYS FROM T WHICHEVER IS	LICANT IS THIS LATER, TO			
	/DAVID P. BRYANT/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Ur	nit 3726				